1	you've indicated 40 witnesses. Now, I don't know if those,
2	those I'm assuming that 4 the number 40 incorporates the
3	party witnesses as well as the this is not 40 people from
4	40 citizens from the Baltimore area.
5	MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: It is?
7	MR. GREENEBAUM: Yes, it was.
8	MR. HOWARD: Yes, Your Honor, it includes the party
9	witnesses.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: It includes the party witnesses.
11	All right. So what would be your, what would be your intended
12	universe of non-party public witnesses?
13	MR. HOWARD: 35, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: 35? So you're talking, then, about
15	5 principles, that is, party witnesses who are either officers
16	or employees.
17	MR. HOWARD: At most.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: At most. All right. And you will
19	be required to disclose those to counsel for Scripps Howard.
20	I, I've set a date of by June 18. Now, again, anything that
21	counsel work out around these dates, that's that's
22	certainly that's shorter, you're encouraged to do that.
23	But that get those will bring us back to, to the 35.
24	First of all, I don't think I'm going to give you
25	35 witnesses, but I, I, I there's going to be a number of

witnesses that are going to have to be handled in this case.

And I want to propose this as a way to do it. That way I'd

think we'd simply if and hopefully would meet what everybody

wants to prove in this case.

And that is to get the written statements, the sworn, written statements of these public witnesses. And that could be done during the month of August or from now until the month of August. I mean -- you'd have to -- you could start tomorrow. Exchange those statements and then set a deposition schedule. That is, decide which of those witnesses would want to be deposed and then, when it would come to receiving evidence on admissions day, which will be in October, we'll have an admissions -- an evidentiary admissions session here, the parties would -- ideally the parties would be able to offer into evidence the sworn written statements.

And for those that there's a question that has come up in cross-examination through the deposition process, the deposition can also be offered into evidence. And in that way it won't be -- it would not be necessary for the public witnesses to have to come in and testify in open court. All the evidence would be that -- all the evidence that you could conceivably -- that could conceivably be brought out here before me would already be in the record.

And unless there's some unusual situation of demeanor testimony or -- I mean in my experience with these

kinds of witnesses, that just generally is not the case. I mean it's -- what they're saying is going to be pretty 3 straightforward and as far as their ability to recollect or their ability to get the facts straight, you're going to have 5 an opportunity to depose them and it would facilitate the time that would have to be spent in court by the parties and by the attorneys and by myself. So if, if I could get a mutual 7 understanding of that. Mr. Howard. 9 MR. HOWARD: I've got a question, Your Honor. 10 -- in terms of the depositions, would you -- when you, when you state that we would set a deposition schedule, would you 11 12 review those requests for depositions for relevance? 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if there's going to be an 14 opposition to a deposition, yeah, I, I'd have to do that. But, again, if I'm going to receive -- you really come up with 15 16 the choice -- there's really two choices. Either you, you 17 introduce the sworn written testimony of these witnesses and 18 let's say there's an opposition to their being deposed and, 19 and, and for some reason or other you convince me that they 20 shouldn't be deposed. 21 Then you run the risk of my -- when it comes down 22 to admissions, I'm in -- that the other side's going to 23 persist in wanting to cross-examine the witness. I may decide 24 at that point, well, all right. We'll have to bring them in

and we'll cross-examine them here. I, I can't obviously rule

25

out the opportunity to cross-examine these witnesses. 2 MR. HOWARD: And, and that risk -- lessened by the 3 deposition, the fact would exist even after the depositions --4 I would, I would rule on -- if the JUDGE SIPPEL: 5 parties agreed. I mean, the, the ruling of the case would be 6 that there will be no live testimony of any witness that has, 7 that has proffered sworn, written testimony and has been 8 deposed or has been -- the opportunity has been made to 9 It can be -- it could be that the other side may not 10 want to even bother deposing someone. I mean, after they see 11 the swear -- the sworn, written statement. I mean, you know, 12 it's expensive to depose people. So, you're nodding -- I take 13 it you're nodding in agreement on this. Is that -- I'm 14 looking at Mr. Howard. 15 MS. SCHMELTZER: Your Honor, we think this seems 16 very fair and is consistent with what I've seen done in other 17 hearings. 18 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Then that's, that's the, 19 that's the way we'll proceed. 20 MR. HOWARD: It's satisfactory, Your Honor. 21 JUDGE SIPPEL: And that's -- thank you, Mr. Howard. 22 And we'll, we'll map out a time frame. We'll just set some 23 dates for that. That's -- all right. Let me, let me start 24 then by -- let me start then by setting some dates. 25 motion for the production of documents are to be filed and

served by June 11th. And any oppositions would have to be 2 served and filed by June 16th. Now, alternatively, there can 3 be a stipulation on document production. Now, if it's going to get into motions, I'm going to -- since the part-- the attorneys are here in Washington, I'm going to require hand 6 delivery, because I'm giving a pretty short turnaround time 7 for oppositions. 8 June 16th, you said? MS. SCHMELTZER: 9 JUDGE SIPPEL: June 16th would be the -- any 10 oppositions. Now, again, in the meantime when they say if

that there's going to be a fight over, you know, I, I would expect that there'd be a stipulation filed that we're going to, you know, we're going to exchange these categories of documents, but we need a ruling on this -- these others, something simple to that effect.

	1 nature and purpose of their testimony.
	Now, I'm also going to re I know that Scripps
	2. Howard has received the intermetion statement but of of
	A)15
	<b>"</b>
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	
70	
grant Manager	
7	
7/	
77	
7/1	
Y)	
í	

1	depositions of I'm not talking about the non-party public
2	witnesses, but some if there's some fact issue that there'd
3	be a non-party witness involved with, I, I'm just going to
4	I'll, I'll play that one as it comes.
5	MS. SCHMELTZER: Well, I would assume with respect
6	to all of the Scripps Howard people who are sponsoring their
7	renewal expectancy exhibits, they would make them available.
8	I wouldn't I assumed we would not need subpoenas for those
9	people.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, they're all going to be I
11	mean, I'm going to I would view them all as parties anyway.
12	MS. SCHMELTZER: Right.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: They're either going to be officers
14	and/or employees
15	MS. SCHMELTZER: Exactly.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: or agents
17	MS. SCHMELTZER: Okay.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: of Scripps Howard. I'm just
19	trying to think of something
20	MS. SCHMELTZER: So it's just the public witnesses.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're going to get the documents by
22	the 25th and you're going to be going through documents and
23	Scripps Howard's going to be doing the same and if they come
24	up and say, hey, we need to depose this particular person for
25	this particular reason, I'll just as I say. I'll just

1	leave that to you, you know. You all know how to get a
2	subpoena application up to me.
3	But I, but I say, I, I would be surprised to see
4	that. I think this is going to be pretty straightforward.
5	The taking of the depositions I'm going to set a time frame
6	here, July 7th to July 30th. It would be during the month of
7	July that you'd be expected to complete all those depositions.
8	Now, I've outlined the procedure with respect to
9	the, the public witnesses. That is, the non-party public
10	witnesses and I'm going to have a cut-off date of August the
11	20th for the exchange of their frozen testimony. Now, when I
12	say exchange, there's also, there's also the possibility that
13	Four Jacks is going to want to put some testimony on of, of
14	public non-party witnesses. Do you anticipate that at all,
15	Mr. Leader?
16	MR. LEADER: It's possible.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Then the same rules
18	would apply for you or for your you would have to proceed
19	the same way.
20	MR. LEADER: Of course ours may be in the form of
21	rebuttal witnesses.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, rebuttal's a different issue.
23	Rebut you know, I mean, they've had they're claiming
24	renewal expectancy and you're going to be getting depositions.
25	MR. LEADER: I just

JUDGE SIPPEL: Rebuttal's a different issue. But I hear you. In any event, August 20 is the date that I'm going to set as the cut-off date for the exchange of these, these frozen, sworn, written statements from these public non-party witnesses. I'm going to get back into the numbers of these witnesses, after I get finished running through these dates, because that may distract us a little bit.

problem.

The depositions, the contemplated depositions of the public witnesses, would run from August through September recognizing, of course, that August and early September is a very dangerous vacation time and you're going to be dealing with, with public witnesses. And I'll do anything within reason to accommodate whatever you need to do to accommodate their schedules.

Now, I want to set an admissions session -- well, let me back up again. I'm going to set an admissions session for October the 5th and a commencement to the hearing here in Washington, D.C. on the 13th of October. The 13th of October is, is the middle of the week. I understand that. It's a Wednesday, but again we're dealing with local counsel and I'm trying to leave one day between the end of a, of a long weekend so that parties or whosever participating in this case isn't going to be inconvenienced -- Mr. Greenebaum?

FREE STATE REPORTING, INC.

Court Reporting Depositions
D.C. Area (301) 261-1902
Balt. & Annap. (410) 974-0947

MR. GREENEBAUM: Well, I've got, I've got a small

I'm not sure I can be specific. When we met to

|prepare the joint report, I advised Ms. Schmeltzer that I had trials set in Denver in related but different matters with 3 different parties in late June or early July and I was worried about the September trial date, notwithstanding those trials. 5 Just that it was tight. 6 On reconsideration to accommodate this hearing, I 7 have put in motion -- I don't -- I think it's going to be 8 granted as we're here, motion to continue those trials to 9 Sep-- to October and November. They're each about a week to 10 I did that in order to accommodate the September 11 hearing. I didn't know that Your Honor was going to raise 12 this issue. It may not be a problem. It may be in, in the, 13 in the gaps here, but I won't know till possibly the end of 14 this week or early next week. 15 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I guess -- I'm -- I guess my 16 -- if there's a priority of orders, I mean, I quess if my 17 order comes down before the other one does, I, I mean, if that 18 would be of any use to you in terms of, of convincing the 19 court to go back again. I, I'll just -- we'll just have to

MR. GREENEBAUM: Probably ten days ago. We, we, we've -- our counsel in Denver, which is our office, we have an office there, has agreed to a stipulated order in both cases with the other counsel. One side being the city and

again see what happens. I would expect that -- how long ago

was it that you contacted the court out there?

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	county of Denver and the State of Colorado, and the other
2	being a, a private citizen. And those orders have been I
3	can't say whether they've been handed to the court or not. My
4	understanding is they were drafted and the dates were agreed
5	upon and they're in process with, with consent dates.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if somebody, somebody from
7	your team wants to leave the room and starting making a phone
8	call, I'd however you want to handle it.
9	MR. GREENEBAUM: Call Nadine and ask her to check
10	with
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: But it's
12	MR. GREENEBAUM: The time difference is what kills
13	me, Your Honor.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, it's quarter of ten now and
15	it's what quarter of nine out there?
16	MR. GREENEBAUM: Quarter to eight.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Quarter to eight? Okay. You'll
18	have to wait until, until a later time today. Unless you know
19	somebody there that gets in the office early?
20	MR. GREENEBAUM: Well, we can try. Why don't you
21	go call him right now.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I'm going to go forward as
23	though there's not going to be any interference with this
24	schedule. I, I don't see how, in light of all that needs to
25	be done in this case, I don't see how I could set it down for,

```
for a hearing in Aug-- in early September. And, and expect
all these things to be done.

MR. GREENEBAUM: I'm only suggesting that we be
flexible on the date in October.

JUDGE SIPPEL: The date in October?

MR. GREENEBAUM: Yeah.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I can be flexible on that.

MR. GREENEBAUM: In other words, if, if we've set
```

1 MR. LEADER: That may have been --2 JUDGE SIPPEL: I don't -- I'm sorry. I'm not going to -- I don't want to cut anybody off, but on the other hand, 3 I don't want this thing to get where I'm thinking that it 5 might qo. I, I just want to say this. We -- he's not talking about and delaying this case for purposes of -- we're talking about a couple of weeks variance one way or the other. 8 as I said to Mr. Greenebaum and I'll say it again, I'm setting 9 -- this is going to be my order. I mean, this -- I'm setting 10 these dates right here and now. 11 If, if my time, if there's a priority of my cases over the cases out in Denver by virtue of the fact that my

procedures for, you know, for straight comparative cases, we are under a lot of deadlines and those dates are generally set by our Office Administrator and with that in mind.

That date becomes meaningless after we get into something like this. Those dates do not -- those mandatory dates do not apply to renewal cases. So, let's, let's just let this run its course and see what happens. We may never even have to talk about this again.

MR. LEADER: I hope not.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, anyway, these are the dates that I'm setting. And I want to get back to what I was doing. Now, I'm, I'm, I'm starting backwards here a bit now. October 13th is the date of the hearing and I've said why I've set that date. There will be an admissions session on the fifth of October and that can run into the sixth of October if need be, but I, I would hope that, I would hope that we could get the documentary evidence and the sworn statements in on a one-day admission session.

Now, that leads me to another procedure that the parties -- I'm going to ask the parties to agree to and that is even with -- although you will have had the depositions, you will have had the depositions of the principals, the procedure that I would suggest would be that you do the same thing.

That you come in with sworn, written statements of

1	the, of the principal witnesses and then they can be put on
2	the stand, they can identify the their statement and the
3	documents that they're sponsoring, and then turn the party
4	over for cross-examination as they do in the standard
5	comparative cases.
6	Rather than go through the drawn-out process of
7	taking direct testimony. Is that okay with
8	MS. SCHMELTZER: Perfectly.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: the Four Jacks? Mr. Howard?
10	MR. LEADER: Yes, Your Honor.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Then that's the
12	procedure that we will use. So, there'll be an exchange of
13	those direct cases, that is, the party testimony on the 13th
14	of September, again by hand delivery. Then on the 17th of
15	September there'll be the notification of witnesses of
16	those witnesses that are desired for cross-examination.
17	Now, again, I'm, I'm going to assume that all of
18	them are probably going to be cross-examined, but then again
19	but I want to go through these formalities, because they
20	may be only two or five that you want to cross-examine. But
21	notifications would go out on the 17th of September. Now,
22	that can be done by fax, because that's just a one- or two-
23	page sheet.
24	Not to me. You have to hand-serve it to me,
25	because I don't have a fax capability, but you can fax between

one another. Objections to cross-examination by September the 2 22nd. And again, that will be by fax, with hand-delivery to me. And then I will make a ruling on or before the admission session if there's any opposition to somebody's cross-examination.

Now, again, I want to emphasize that I'm talking about the cross-examination of the party witnesses. We're not talking at all about the public witnesses who have been handled in that other procedure -- with that other procedure. But it would be at the admissions session of October 5 that you would be introducing into evidence here the sworn, written statements, plus the depositions, if any, of the public witnesses.

All right. Those are my dates and they're, they're issued pursuant to a bench ruling. They might not come out in writing until tomorrow, but this is the same as -- equivalent to an order. I have a -- I now want to get into the subject of the numbers of these witnesses.

Thirty-five it seems to me is a considerable number of people and I mean I know you've got important things to put in the record. I'm not, not trying to under, underscore that, but it would seem to me that you'd be able to tell the same story with 20 people as you could be able to say with 35. I really don't -- I, I, I mean I'm hard-pressed to say why I think that, because I don't know what you have in mind. I'm

- not so sure how clearly you have articulated it in your own
- 2 mind. Thirty-five people is a lot of people.
- 3 MR. HOWARD: Well, it -- I think that we -- in, in
- 4 terms of discussions with the client, it, it -- this is what
- 5 we think that that would be -- people who would have something
- 6 to add to the reputation of the station in the community.
- 7 It's a. a well-known station. There are benefits that could

1	put on notice as to the purpose for why you're putting those
2	witnesses on, so that they can have an opportunity to
3	seek surrebutter.
4	I haven't focused on rebuttal witnesses here this
5	morning except in response to what you've said, Mr. Leader,
6	and I may address that in my order, you know, giving us some
7	instruction in cut-off dates with respect to rebuttal
8	witnesses. Both sides will have ample time. And this, again,
9	is why in, you know, for Mr. Greenebaum's benefit we, you
10	know, this case has got to go into October just to permit
11	adequate preparation and
12	MR. GREENEBAUM: In that connection, Your Honor,
13	that we were not able to reach anyone in our Denver office.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: No, nobody's there?
15	MS. GOSS: No answer.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: They're not early risers out there?
17	MR. GREENEBAUM: Actually they are usually, but
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: Not, not the day that you need
19	them. Well, all right. Well, I'm going to as I say, I'm
20	just going to assume that these dates are firm and if, if
21	relief is needed, whoever needs the relief is going to have to
22	file a motion it's going to have to be done promptly and
23	we'll, we'll take it up. But it well, we've, we've said
24	enough about it. Is there any other business that anybody
25	else wants to raise this morning?

1	MS. SCHMELTZER: I, I just wanted to raise two
2	points, Your Honor. You said you'd received a motion to
3	correct a Memorandum Opinion and Order. We haven't seen that.
4	Can you just tell me who filed that?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that was filed by Scripps
6	Howard.
7	MS. SCHMELTZER: Okay.
8	MR. HOWARD: We mailed, we mailed it to your
9	office.
10	MS. SCHMELTZER: Okay, fine.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: It's I'll wait. You know, I'm
12	going to wait till you respond to it.
13	MS. SCHMELTZER: And the Motion to Strike that
14	Scripps Howard filed, our opposition was due today, but
15	frankly that was on the renewal expectancy. I'm not sure it's
16	necessary to file anything now.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
18	MS. SCHMELTZER: In fact, I don't think it is.
19	MR. LEADER: Unless you want us
20	MS. SCHMELTZER: Unless you want us to.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: I, I think you should. I think you
22	should submit it in writing because I'm going to rule on it
23	and I, I don't think that you'd want to see a ruling that said
24	that there was, you know, that there was no opposition to it.
25	You get something in by the end of the day. I'll be frank. I

|mean, I am, I am -- even if I, even if I would strike it, I 2 mean I certainly looked at it very closely before I came in 3 here this morning and it's, it's something that does give me 4 quidance. 5 I know that these are all -- sometimes these 6 documents come in in an argumentative fashion and I'm not 7 drawing any ultimate conclusions from it, but it's good to hear -- to read in advance what both sides are thinking. 9 I will, I will expect a responsive pleading sometime today 10 from Ms. Schmeltzer. Is there anything else? 11 MR. LEADER: Not from us, Your Honor. 12 JUDGE SIPPEL: You don't have anything else? All 13 If, you know, if there's a problem and you need a 14 conference --15 MS. SCHMELTZER: You said you were awaiting replies 16 on four motions. Can we just be clear on, on what those are? 17 Did you have those -- because I -- on the Motion for Summary 18 Decision, there is no reply. That's ripe for action. There's no reply --19 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I've already acted on one, one 21 Motion for Summary Decision. I've already acted on one of I mean, is there another one around that I --22 23 I think there's only one. MS. SCHMELTZER: 24 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's -- I, I ruled on that 25 on -- it was at least June 1. 93M-315.

1	MS. SCHMELTZER: We haven't seen it.
2	MR. LEADER: We haven't seen it.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Haven't seen it?
4	MS. SCHMELTZER: It takes a while to get orders,
5	unfortunately.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, if anybody wants, I mean, I
7	can have make a copy available in my office if somebody
8	wants to call and get it and, and, and fax it to him, if
9	somebody wants to volunteer for that, but this was the Motion
10	for Summary Decision on the air hazard issue and I the
11	Bureau supported the motion and I granted the motion. So it's
12	not a very long, windy ruling.
13	MS. SCHMELTZER: All right. Then I understand the
14	four motions that are outstanding.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's then you know what
16	they are?
17	MS. SCHMELTZER: Right.
18	JUDGE SIPPEL: But they're considerable motions.
19	MS. SCHMELTZER: Right.
20	JUDGE SIPPEL: I mean, they're, they're going to be
21	looked at very, very carefully and the and if, if by chance
22	any one of them were granted, it could affect the dates that
23	we're talking about. I would stay I'm staying with these
24	dates. I don't mean to say that those dates would, would be
25	dropped. I'm saying that it would require a second phase, but

1	I'm very, very concerned about keeping these dates and to the
2	extent that Mr. Greenebaum can impart that to the Denver
3	situation I would appreciate it, because you definitely need
4	the time to get ready for this case.
5	All right. That's all that I have. If I say,
6	if the parties need anything, if there if you if there's
7	a problem with discovery and you think that I can help, we'll,
8	we'll arrange for a conference. I encourage stipulations, I
9	encourage voluntary disclosure to the extent possible and I'll
10	rule as rapidly as I can on any disputes. That's it then.
11	We're in, we're in recess until the fifth of October unless
12	there's another reason. Thank you.
13	(Whereupon, at 10:00 a.m., the proceeding was adjourned.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

APPLICATIONS OF SCRIPPS HOWARD BROADCASTING COMPANY

Name AND FOUR JACKS BROADCASTING, INC. MM DOCKET NO. 93-94 Docket No. WASHINGTON, D.C. Place JUNE 3, 1993 Date We, the undersigned, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages, numbers \_\_\_\_25 \_\_ through \_\_\_70 \_\_\_, inclusive, are the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the \_\_ in attendance at the above identified proceeding, in accordance with applicable provisions of the current Federal Communications Commission's professional verbatim reporting and transcription Statement of Work and have verified the accuracy of the transcript by (1) comparing the typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the proceeding and (2) comparing the final proofed typewritten transcript against the reporting or recording accomplished at the proceeding. June 10, 1993 . Transcriber